

Remarks

Request for Reconsideration

Applicants have carefully considered the matters raised by Examiner in the outstanding Office Action, but remain of the position that patentable subject matter is present. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of Examiner's position based on the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

Claim Status

Claims 1-16 are pending.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 13, and 16 have been amended herein. The specific amendments will be discussed in more detail below.

Claims 7-12 and 15 had also been indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Claim 7 and 15 have been rewritten to place them into independent format as well as to address the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection.

Information Disclosure Statement

Examiner notes the listing of references in the ISR was not a proper information disclosure statement.

In order to fully comply hereto, a list of ISR documents and those cited in the specification have been prepared and are included, along with an SB08A Form and copies of all non-US Patent Office Publications, with this response.

Drawing Objections

The drawings had been objected to for failing to show the subject matter of claim 9.

Applicants respectfully disagree. The subject matter of claim 9 is shown in Fig. 2.

The drawings had been further objected to because they fail to show the groove 2k as annular as described in the specification.

Applicants respectfully disagree. Figure 2 shows annular groove 2k.

Specification

The disclosure had been objected to because of the following informalities:

Lines 10-11, page 13, are not understood.

The disclosure has been amended herein and is now deemed clear.

On page 14, line 20, “7b” should be –7a--.

The disclosure has been amended herein.

Claim Rejections (35 U.S.C. § 112)

Claims 7-12, 14, and 16 had been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctively claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Examiner contends claim 7 is unclear with respect to the phrase “in the process,” and claims 8-12 because they depend on claim 7.

Claim 7 has been amended herein to clarify what is meant by “in the process.”

Examiner contends claim 14 is indefinite, as it refers to plural “the rows,” whereas claim 1 only defines “at least one row.”

Claim 1 has been amended herein and, thus, based on claim 1 as it now stands, it is Applicants’ position claim 1 is acceptable as it stands.

Examiner contends claim 16 is indefinite because it lacks a proper antecedent basis for “the wheel flange.”

Claim 16 has been amended herein to provide a proper antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections (35 U.S.C. § 102)

Claims 1-6, 13, 14, and 16 had been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Griseri *et al.* (US 2002/0015545).

Griseri does not disclose scalloped sections on the flange attached to the outer ring. Claim 1 has been amended herein to point out this difference. Claims 2-6, 13, 14, and 16 ultimately depend upon claim 1. Thus, claims 2-6, 13, 14, and 16 are also patentable over Griseri.

Claim 14 had been rejected because Examiner contends Griseri discloses a radial shoulder that is formed in one piece with the outer ring between the rows.

Applicants disagree that Griseri and Applicants' design is the same. As addressed above, claim 1 is distinguishable from Griseri and, thus, claim 14 is acceptable.

Claim 16 had been rejected because Examiner contends Griseri discloses that the wheel carrier engages around at least the raceway of the outer ring, a hub, which is supported in the outer ring via the rolling bodies, on the raceway in such a way that it can rotate about the rotational axis, and a wheel flange leading radially from the hub.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 15 had been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 15 has been amended into independent format.

Claims 7-12 objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 7 has been amended to address the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, and to place it into independent format.

Respectfully, claims 7-12 and 15 are allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any extensions of time or fees be necessary in order to maintain this Application in pending condition, appropriate requests are hereby made and authorization is given to debit Account No. 02-2275.

Respectfully submitted,

LUCAS & MERCANTI, LLP

By: Donald C. Lucas
Donald C. Lucas, 31,275
Attorney for Applicant(s)
475 Park Avenue South, 15th Floor
New York, NY 10016
Tel. 212-661-8000

DCL/JRW/ns